



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JESUS THE SON OF GOD

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON

YALE UNIVERSITY

I. THE LOGION MT. 11 25-27, LK. 10 21-22, AND ITS PARALLELS.

No passage of the Synoptic Gospels throws so much light upon Jesus' sense of his own mission as that which deals with Knowing the Father and Being Known of Him in Mt. 11 25-27, Lk. 10 21-22. It belongs to the common element of Matthew and Luke unknown in Mark, and in the judgment of the great majority of critics must therefore be referred to a common source of high antiquity. In short, as respects attestation, its claims to authenticity are unexcelled. As respects content, it deals with the all-important matter of Jesus' doctrine of divine sonship, and yet it seems to stand alone among Synoptic sayings, and to be paralleled only by utterances ascribed to Jesus by the fourth evangelist. But the Johannine discourses give every indication of having been composed by the evangelist himself in order to expound in dialogue form his own deutero-pauline Christology. The only instance in all Synoptic tradition of anything comparable to this apposition of "the Son . . . the Father," is Mk. 13 32, Mt. 24 36.

Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

But this Markan saying cannot be employed to prove the superhuman consciousness of Jesus; for in the Lukan version of the same saying, Acts 1 7,

It is not for you to know times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority,

the apposition disappears, and, in view of Mark's freedom in the composition of the eschatological chapter (Mk. 13), and of his individual Christology as reflected at the beginning and end of his gospel (Mk. 1 1 and 15 39),¹ it is more reasonable to attribute to the evangelist the reference to "the Son" in Mk. 13 32. The

¹ The paraphrase of Is. 5 1-7 in Mk. 12 1-9 reflects the same standpoint and is better understood as an allegorical composition of the evangelist than as an authentic parable of Jesus, though a parable somewhat resembling this is inserted by Mt. just before it (Mt. 21 28-32).

original saying was, then, no parallel to our logion, and the latter remains unique. It is the sole unshakable utterance of Jesus to which the doctrine of his divine sonship can be referred. And yet, even after the most drastic application of both textual and higher criticism, it does remain unshaken; and it well deserves its description as "the Johannine passage," for it forms, however interpreted, a true link of connection between Synoptic and Johannine Christology.

We are bound, nevertheless, by all sane principles of criticism, and of exegesis as well, to prefer that form of text and that interpretation which leave the saying in harmony with the rest of Synoptic tradition rather than a text and interpretation whose affinities are all with the Fourth Gospel. Such a form and interpretation may reveal a root from which the later developed Christology might spring; any other could give us no more than an erratic block, in which the geologist must see violent displacement from its original bed.

Harnack² has recently submitted the textual evidence to a searching examination. Since it is not our present object to test his results, but to present an interpretation applicable whether these results be accepted or not, it will suffice merely to indicate by square brackets the material he omits, and by marks of parenthesis the altered readings which he introduces.

Mt. 11 25-27

25 At that season Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: **26** yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. **27** All things have been delivered unto me of [my] Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal *him*.

Lk. 10 21-22

21 In that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes: yea, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in thy sight. **22** All things have been delivered unto me of [my] Father: and no one (hath recognized) [who the Son is save the Father; and] who the Father is, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son [willeth to] reveal (eth) *him*.³

² Sprüche und Reden Jesu, 1907, Exkurs I, pp. 189-211.

³ In the extract only Harnack's positive results are exhibited. He leaves it doubtful, for example, whether the order in Mt. 11 27 should not be "the Father . . .

From a comparison of these emended texts of Mt. and Lk. Harnack concludes that the common source (Q) represented by their coincident material read as follows:

At that season Jesus answered and said, I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them to babes; yea Father, for such was thy good pleasure. All things were delivered to me by the Father, and no one hath known the Father [or who the Father is] save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son maketh the revelation.

We ourselves are not so much concerned with the sense given to the passage by our first and third evangelists, as with the sense it bore in their common source, now commonly designated Q.⁴ It may well be, as has recently been declared by no less weighty and unprejudiced an authority than Jülicher, that

The evangelist who makes Jesus exclaim, No one knoweth the Son save the Father and likewise no one knoweth the Father save the Son (Mt. 11 27; cf. Lk. 10 22), surely presupposes in him a consciousness derived from another world and period.⁵

An evangelist demonstrably dependent on Mark, one who takes over and improves upon the "high" Christology of his predecessor, and who seems even to have adapted this very logion to the form of a post-resurrection commission to the apostles to make converts of all the nations (Mt. 28 18), may well have accepted a Pauline Christology with all its implications of pre-existence. But the inquirer into the pre-pauline conceptions, the historian of the doctrine, who would know what Jesus himself felt to be

the Son . . . the Son . . . the Father," and whether in the last clause we should not read "revealeth," as in the emended Lk., instead of "willeth to reveal." As these are merely possible changes and make no practical difference to the sense, they are not indicated.

⁴ So the Germans generally and Salmon (*The Human Element in the Gospels*, 1907). The designation is better than L (W. C. Allen, *International Critical Comm.*, 1907) or A (H. J. Holtzmann, *Synoptische Evangelien*, 1863), for it does not prejudice the question of the relation of this Mt.-Lk. source to the Matthaean "Logia of the Lord" mentioned by Papias. Burton and Sharman of Chicago University employ the letters G (Galilean document) and P (Perean document) for the respective intercalations of Lk. 6 20-8 8 and 9 51-18 14, which other critics designate together as Q.

⁵ Paulus und Jesus, 1907, p. 31.

implied in his own "sonship," will not delay over secondary and derived information when primary sources are accessible. Mark and the first evangelist show the form of the tradition current in the period 70-90 A.D.; for the period 40-60 A.D. we are able to use as a standard of comparison the Pauline epistles and the reported utterances of Jesus himself in the material drawn from Q and common to Matthew and Luke.⁶

In this earlier material we are fortunately not devoid of parallels for either portion of the logion. Even if we grant the cogency of Harnack's textual argument for attributing to our first evangelist, and not to Q, the clause "no one knoweth the Son save the Father," yet the Pauline epistles will furnish evidence, as we hope to show, that this supposed addition is no invention of the evangelist, but is itself an expression of the spirit of Jesus. Besides Q and the Pauline epistles we have a further resource in the contemporary Jewish literature. Of all these aids we must avail ourselves in order to determine in what sense utterances concerning "the Son," "the Father," would be understood by Jesus' auditors, and must therefore, since he had no purpose to mislead, have been intended by himself.

Harnack⁷ very justly indorses the judgment of Pfleiderer in finding in 1 Cor. 1 19 21 a Pauline parallel to our logion so close in thought and to some extent even in language as to suggest direct literary dependence:

For it is written,

I will destroy the wisdom of the wise,
And the prudence of the prudent will I reject.

. . . For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe.

⁶ That this common Mt.-Lk. discourse material (Q) is not derived by one of these evangelists directly from the other has been conclusively demonstrated by Wernle (*Synoptische Frage*, 1899, pp. 40-80), and is an accepted result of New Testament science. Even Allen pleads only for an "influence" of Matthew upon Luke. Advocates of oral tradition (A. Wright) make their oral source the equivalent of a document, since its form is so stereotyped as to make the resemblance of Mt. to Lk. closer in the portions not shared by Mk. than in the parts taken by each from this admittedly written source.

⁷ *Sprüche und Reden Jesu*, p. 210, note 1.

On the question whether Paul is dependent on the logion or Q influenced by Paul, there is disagreement. Harnack rejects Pffeiderer's decision in favor of the latter alternative, on the ground that "babes" (νήπιοι) "is not Pauline."⁸ And yet in the same context, scarcely more than a score of verses further on (1 Cor. 3 1) Paul applies this very term "babes" (νήπιοι) to his Corinthian converts as recipients of the revelation.

Important as this matter of the relation of Paul to Q undoubtedly is, we may still leave the question of priority undecided. The essential point for the interpreter is the existence of the relation, and this becomes the more apparent the more closely we scrutinize the two contexts.

As regards the setting of the logion in Q, accepting Harnack's textual results, we can go no further than the coincidence of Matthew and Luke allows. As this comprises, however, all the evidence we have, and as all bears in one direction, there is no likelihood of contradiction for Harnack's conclusion⁹ that in the source it stood between the Woes on the Unrepentant Cities of Galilee and the Denunciation of the Scribes who Blasphemed the Spirit and demanded a sign from Heaven. Pursuing the sequence a little further back it would appear that the Woes against the Unrepentant Cities followed upon the Complaint against the Generation which was satisfied neither with the "wailing" of the Baptist's disciples nor the "piping" of the followers of Jesus, and this in turn came after the Mission of the Twelve, which itself was preceded by the incident of the Centurion whose faith put to shame the unbelief of Israel. Certainly one cannot fail to perceive the dominant motive in this sequence, particularly as it reappears so strongly both in Paul (Rom. 9-11) and in all our canonical evangelists (Mt. 4 1-25, 12 1-12, 13 1-23, 21 33-43, Lk. 4 16-30, 24 44-49, Acts *passim*, Jn. 12 20-43). The author of Q treated the logion as a rebuke of the dull ears and blind eyes of unbelieving Israel, in this respect following the lead of Paul, and being followed by all our evangelists.

⁸ Yet our passage furnishes the only occurrence of the word in the gospels (save the quotation from Ps. 8 3 in Mt. 21 16) against eleven occurrences in the Pauline epistles.

⁹ Sprüche und Reden Jesu, p. 126.

In 1 Cor. 1 18, 2 16 the flesh which "glories before God (1 29) is not indeed, as in Rom. 2 17-20, the Jew who claims to "know God" and to be "a teacher of babes," but the wise in their own esteem generally. In the logion as originally intended it is of course "the wise and understanding" of Israel, the scribes, who are meant, and their oppressive yoke is contrasted with that of Jesus in the invitation framed by Matthew as an appendix to it from Eccus. 6 28, 51 26 ff.¹⁰ Only the compiler, to whom is due the context of Q's sequence, seems to have had in mind the peculiar pretensions and the signal rejection of Israel as a whole. With the evangelists and Paul alike we have here an application, now wider, now narrower, of the passage Is. 29 9-24, a favorite passage of Paul¹¹ and also used more than once in Q.¹² In representing the "babes" as the choice of God's "good pleasure" to receive revelation, Paul is only extending to the spiritually disinherited of the gentile world the assurance which Jesus had given to his "little flock" of repentant sinners and synagogue outcasts. He bases it explicitly on the Isaian passage which tacitly underlies the logion.

II. THE REVELATION GIVEN TO THE LOWLY.

The comparison of Paul's rhapsody over "the word of the cross," "the foolishness of the preaching," with Jesus' exultation over the revelation given to his "little ones," and the connection of both with their common Old Testament basis, is much more than a mere vindication of the authenticity of the saying. It already goes far toward determining its sense; and this in turn, as it becomes clearer, will enable us to detect parallels perhaps hitherto unsuspected.

The fundamental point of agreement of all three witnesses, the logion, the Isaian passage, and the Pauline, is the vindication of

¹⁰ Mt. 11 28-30, which fails to appear in Luke, seems, beautiful as it is, to be of the evangelist's composition from phrases derived from the Wisdom-literature. See W. C. Allen, *ad loc.*, in *Internat. Crit. Commentary*, 1907, and Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, p. 338, for the parallels.

¹¹ Rom. 11 8, Col. 2 2, 1 Cor. 1 29 30, 3 19, Rom. 9 20 21, 2 Tim. 2 20 21, 2 Cor. 1 3 4, 7 6, 1 Thess. 3 7, 4 18, 5 14.

¹² Cf. besides the present passage Mt. 11 5, Lk. 4 18, 7 22.

the revelation given to the unlearned, the lowly, the plain people, against the usurpations of ecclesiastical authority. In the time of Amos God had been free to choose as the bearer of his message a herdsman, a dresser of sycamore trees, in preference to the prophet by avocation, if it so pleased him (Am. 7 14 15). Isaiah already felt the pressure of hierocratic usurpation, and followed the lead of Amos in pouring scorn upon the prophets "whose eyes are closed," the seers "whose heads are covered," the learned to whom "all vision is become as the words of a book that is sealed," so that God turns to "the meek" and "the poor," making the children to sanctify his name, and erring spirits and "stammering lips to utter peace."¹³ Since the extinction of the voice of prophecy, and the establishment of the exclusive authority of the synagogue and the written law, the usurpations of the professional religionist had become in Jesus' time immeasurably more intolerable still. A coterie of scribes with a few thousand Pharisaic followers had arrogated to themselves alone the spiritual inheritance of Israel. Sitting in Moses' seat with their prerogative of the interpretation of the written law, they held the keys of the kingdom of heaven. They entered not in themselves, and the masses that would enter in by the broad door of the baptism of John and the proclamation of forgiveness and adoption by Jesus they hindered. They had made it impossible for the average son or daughter of Abraham to expect any "part in the world to come"; for this phrase had come to be the current expression for a share in the common national inheritance, the birthright of the sons of Abraham, the messianic hope. As the Gracchi in Rome became the champions of the lowly against the usurpation of the common domain by the aristocracy, so John the Baptist and Jesus resisted the usurpation of the common spiritual inheritance in Israel. To Jesus the baptism of John had been a sign from heaven (Mt. 21 23-25). John himself had been an Elias, the "restorer of the tribes" (Ecclus. 48 10), having as his mission not merely the "great repentance" (Mal. 4 5 6), but the turning of fathers to children and children to their fathers, in the sense of restoring those who had been excluded by violence and wrongfully, and excluding those who had usurped the place of

¹³ Is. 29 9-24 (LXX).

the sons and daughters of Abraham.¹⁴ As such a sign the Baptist's warning of "wrath to come" had been "a greater matter" than the preaching of Jonah to the Ninevites, and the generation which rejected it were bringing on themselves greater condemnation (Mt. 12 41).¹⁵

The Isaian basis of our logion, the Pauline parallel, the gospel affinities, the context and internal evidence of the logion itself, all combine to show that we must interpret it in the light of this championship by Jesus of the cause of the lost sheep, and of the lost son against the grudging elder brother. The "weary and heavy laden" to whom is given the invitation, "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me," which Matthew appropriately appends, are those that have been learning of the scribes in Moses' seat, those scribes who make the yoke of the law more and more grievous and intolerable, "binding heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, which they themselves did not touch with one of their fingers." The "revelation to babes" for which the supreme Lord is thanked, is the sight and knowledge granted to the pure in heart (Mt. 5 8), more than offsetting the unused "key of knowledge" in the hand of the professional exponent of Mosaism (Mt. 23 13, Lk. 11 52). The spirit of the context is that of the promise of Jer. 31 34 of the days of the new covenant, when

They shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the LORD: for I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more.

In the light of these connected passages it is manifest that those expositors are right who point out that the word here ren-

¹⁴ Mt. 11 12-15. This obscure passage is illuminated by the rabbinic tradition, Edujoth viii, 7, where on the authority of Johanan ben Zakkai the function of Elijah as restorer of the tribes is declared to be, "not to pronounce clean or unclean, to exclude or receive in general, but only to receive those who had been excluded by violence, and to exclude those who had been received by violence." See Bacon, "Elias and the Men of Violence," Expositor, sixth series, xxxi (July, 1902), and W. C. Allen, Intern. Crit. Comm. on Mt., *ad loc.*

¹⁵ On the reference to "the baptism of John" in this answer of Jesus to the demand for a sign from heaven, which Matthew and Luke in contradictory ways endeavor to apply to Jesus himself, see Bacon, Sermon on the Mount, p. 232, and cf. the parallel demand for a sign and its answer, Mt. 21 23-25; also the combination of the two in Jn. 2 18-21.

dered "delivered" (*παρεδόθη*) is not the same as that used in the utterance of Mt. 28 18, "All authority hath been given (*ἐδόθη*) unto me in heaven and on earth," but is the technical term for the conveyance of authoritative doctrine (*παράδοσις*). If the post-resurrection commission (Mt. 28 18) is framed, as seems probable, on our logion, the evangelist has extended the sense beyond the original intention. In reality the logion is more justly paralleled in Jn. 7 16 17, "My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me." Against the "traditions (*παράδοσεις*) of the scribes" Jesus sets the tradition of his Father, which is "hidden from the wise and understanding, but revealed (by the Father) to babes." We are reminded how in a closely connected Lukan passage, denouncing as blind leaders of the blind the scribes and Pharisees who had demanded of him a sign from heaven, he had referred his hearers to "the light that is in thee" as a guide which no other can replace (Lk. 11 34-35). If we penetrate through the setting to the intrinsic sense of the parable of the Good Samaritan, we shall perceive there too a vindication of the inner law against the written. The Samaritan stands contrasted with priest and Levite because in his simple obedience to "the righteousness of God" he puts to shame the professional expounders of Mosaism. It is in the name of himself and his "little ones," then, that Jesus "rejoices in the Holy Spirit," when he thanks the "Lord of heaven and earth" that the scribe has no monopoly of the knowledge of God. The title "Lord of heaven and earth" is chosen, as Amos had chosen equivalent titles (Am. 9 5 6), in protest against a clique of ecclesiastics who imagined themselves able to monopolize knowledge of the Infinite One. Paul delineates for us this would-be monopolizer of the "Lord of heaven and earth." For Paul it is of course not merely the scribe, but the Jew generally in contrast with the untaught gentile, who

rests upon the law and glories in God, having the knowledge of his will, discriminating in matters of casuistry, being instructed out of the law, confident that he himself is a guide of the blind, a light of them that are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of "babes," having in the law the pattern of knowledge and of the truth.

But Paul's expressions belong to a time when the issue regarding inheritance of the kingdom had widened. Jesus' exultation is the

declaration of independence of the old prophetic spirit so long enslaved. It is a reassertion of the rights of the spiritually disinherited of Israel. Paul is the champion of the gentiles, who without the law are a law unto themselves. Both rest ultimately on the same basis. In both cases the appeal is to the awakening Spirit of adoption that witnesseth with our spirit that we are born of God, teaching us to cry, Abba, Father.

III. RELATION OF THE SAYING TO MARK 4 11.

With this recognition of the bearing of the earlier part of our logion must follow a recognition of certain hitherto unsuspected affinities.

On the surface there is little to indicate the affinity of this saying with that attributed to Jesus in Mk. 4 11,

To you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God, but for them that are without all things are done in parables.

We believe this Markan saying, however, to be a genuine variant of our logion. Our second evangelist is notably free in his citations of logia, adapting them to his own purposes, and frequently, as in Mk. 1 15, giving them a tincture of Pauline phraseology. The use here of the Pauline term "the mystery" for "the revelation," and the adaptation of the logion to a theory of the teaching in parables which is obviously the evangelist's own creation, though also based on Paul,¹⁶ has obscured the relation. But Clement of Alexandria has fortunately preserved for us from an

¹⁶ Mk. 4 11 12 is an editorial insertion quite out of harmony with the context, which presupposes that not merely the parable of the sower, but "all the parables" have preceded (vs. 13), and expresses surprise that explanation should be needed (vs. 13). In vss. 10 and 13 the sense of the question about the parables is not, as assumed in vss. 11 and 12, "Why use this method?" but "What is the meaning of the symbolism?" Vss. 11 12 with their Isaian proof-text apply the Pauline doctrine of the hardening of Israel (Rom. 11 7 8) to the fact that Jesus had taught in "parables," the "parable" being erroneously regarded as an enigma, riddle, or dark saying. Mark doubtless applied the parable of the sower to the hardening of Israel much as Ep. Barn. 9 5 (cf. Heb. 6 8) applies the common prototype of Jer. 4 3, "Sow not upon thorns, break up the fallow ground." But Mark did not *invent* a logion to justify his theory of the parables as a preaching of judgment. He adapted that now under consideration to suit his Pauline theory.

unknown gospel a middle link. In his *Stromata*, v. 10, 69, he declares that he found "in a certain gospel" the saying,

My mystery belongs to me and to the sons of my household.

In the Clementine Homilies xix, 20 the same logion is quoted in a form reminding us of the exclusive spirit of Mt. 7 6,

Keep the mysteries for me and for the sons (*uiols*) of my household.

In these agrapha we are manifestly dealing with the same logion that appears in Mk. 4 11 in a form adapted to Mark's theory of the parabolic method. The reservation of "my mystery" is an unmistakable point of connection with Mark; but the reversion in the latter half of the agraphon to "me and the sons of my household" as the antithesis to "outsiders" shows equally close connection with our logion, indicating that Mark has merely adapted it, after the example of Paul, to the wider issue of his own time, and embodied in it the protest of the spiritual seed of Abraham against Jewish pretensions. Mark has paved the way for this adaptation by introducing immediately before the Teaching in Parables, and between it and the Choosing of the Twelve, the saying in which Jesus declares these to be the "sons of his household,"

And looking round about upon those who were sitting in a circle about him he saith, Behold my mother and my brethren; for whosoever doeth the will of God, he is my brother and sister and mother.

It is a matter of no small significance that our second gospel, in striking contrast to the other two synoptists, entirely excludes the great exhibition of Jesus' teaching delivered to the masses, the Sermon on the Mount, and at the corresponding point introduces a deliverance of "the mystery of the kingdom of God" to the inner circle of Jesus' spiritual kindred, while "to those who are without all things are done in enigmas." We should greatly mistake the intention of this most democratic of all the evangelists if we conceived him to suggest a new spiritual aristocracy, with the apostles as trustees of "the mystery." We must understand the inner circle just as he defines it (Mk. 3 31-35). The "mystery" is given to the believing and obedient (cf. Jn. 7 3-5 17

with Mk. 3 31-35); the preaching to the Jewish people generally is to him a mere "sowing upon thorns."¹⁷

On the other hand Mark does not wholly neglect to justify his drastic theory of the hiding of the revelation from the unbelieving Jewish "outsiders" whom he refuses to call "wise and understanding." At the close of his parenthetical discussion of the reason for Jesus' teaching in parables, he resumes the saying at which he turned aside, "If anyone hath ears to hear, he is the one that shall hear" (Mk. 4 9 and 23), and introduces another logion¹⁸ to qualify the seeming harshness of his doctrine,

For it (the mystery) is not hid but only that it might become known; nor was it concealed but only that it might come to light.

In fact this whole paragraph, Mk. 4 21-25, beginning with the comparison of the lamp that "comes" not to be hidden, but to be lifted up,¹⁹ and ending with the warning to the unreceptive that they will be deprived of their prerogative, can only be appreciated when it is read with reference to this great issue of the first century between Jewish particularism and Christian universalism. Whatever the original sense, to Mark the parable of the good and bad soil and the appended sayings constitute a protest against Jewish claims to monopolize the knowledge of God and the messianic hope.

There can be little doubt in view of these various lines of connection that our second (Roman) evangelist, in his section on the Choosing and Training of the Twelve, extending from Mk. 3 7 to 6 13, has adapted our logion on the Hiding of the Revelation from the wise and understanding and the delivering of it to babes to the special case of the hardening of Israel, the case so vividly brought into the foreground in Paul's great epistle to the Romans. Fortunately we have in 1 Cor. 1 18-3 1, and especially in the

¹⁷ For Mark's estimate of the Jewish people generally and their religious character see Mk. 7 3 4 6 7.

¹⁸ Mk. 4 22 is given twice in Luke. Lk. 8 17=Mk. 4 22; Lk. 12 2=Mt. 10 26.

¹⁹ Commentators differ as to whether in the evangelist's application "the lamp" stands for the Messiah, who is destined to occupy the throne of glory (cf. Rev. 21 23), or, as originally intended, for the gospel message. Either interpretation would suit our contention.

common Isaian basis, Is. 29 9-24, a standard by which to measure the degree of departure from the original sense.

As a guide to the original occasion of the utterance, Mark's setting has but little value. It is true that Matthew also places in the same relation to the parables a saying which Luke subjoins to our logion as part of the congratulation addressed "to the disciples privately":

Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see. For I say unto you that many prophets and kings (*Mt.* righteous men) desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.

In Mt. 13 16-17 this utterance is separated from the logion on the Hiding of the Revelation and appended to the Markan digression on the Parables as a Hiding of the Mystery. It illustrates the saying, "He that hath ears let him hear" (Mt. 13 9, Mk. 4 9). But this displacement is almost certainly due to the influence of Mark. Probably, then, the full content of the saying as it stood in the common source of Matthew and Luke (Q) was as given in Lk. 10 21-24, which we give again in Harnack's reconstruction:

At that season he said, I praise thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes. Yea, Father, for such was the good pleasure before thee. All things (matters of revelation) were delivered to me by the Father, and no one hath recognized (*ἐγνώ*) [the son save the Father, nor hath any recognized] the Father save the son, and he to whomsoever the son willeth to give the revelation. Blessed are your eyes for they see, and [your] ears for they hear; [for verily] I say unto you, many prophets [and kings] desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not, and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not.

Our previous discussion of the context in Q has indicated a tendency already apparent even in this primitive compilation to apply the saying to the wider issue between Jew and gentile.

IV. KNOWING AND BEING KNOWN OF GOD.

That which mainly interests the modern student in this so-called "Johannine" saying is its bearing on the messianic consciousness of Jesus, and it is highly significant that all the affinities of the passage, whether in the Old Testament or the New,

make it a protest against the spiritual disinheritance of the common people at the hands of the professional religionist. In the light of this circumstance it is impossible to suppose that Jesus is speaking either of a "revelation" or of a "sonship" which is his in an exclusive sense. He speaks of himself simply as the leader and champion of those who have no claim to sonship but the ethical, whose only pretension to be "sons of the Father in heaven" and "children of the Highest" rests on their exhibition of that divine spirit of unlimited, disinterested goodness, which "is kind even to the unthankful and the evil" (Mt. 5 43-48, Lk. 6 27-36), who "know the will" as the Good Samaritan knew it. But it was the ancient prerogative of Israel as a people to be "the beloved son" of God, "the first born and only-begotten"; whereas God had said of "the other nations which also come of Adam, that they are nothing," and had "likened them to a drop that falleth from a vessel."²⁰ According to the rabbis the evidence of Israel's special prerogative was that Israel had "knowledge of the law."²¹ Whom indeed of mankind does the Creator destine to inherit his world, if not those to whom he has made the revelation of how and why he created it,²² and of how he wills that men should live in it? No wonder if in the eyes of scribes and Pharisees the people of the land who "knew not the law," and did not so much as lend themselves to the guidance of its authoritative expounders, were "accursed" and worthy of no "share in the world to come." The privilege of the "publicans and sinners" could only be that which Paul later ascribed to the "sinners of the gentiles," not "a righteousness of their own, even that of the law," but the right to "become imitators of God as beloved children and walk in love, even as Christ had loved them and given himself for them" (Eph. 5 1).

But if such be the general bearing of the passage, we may well ask by what right the English versions write "Son" with a capital letter. The true parallel to the use which our logion makes of the term "the son" is Jn. 8 35,

²⁰ 2 Esdr. 6 55-59, referring to Gen. 1 26 27 and Is. 40 15. Cf. Psalms of Solomon 17 30, "He shall take knowledge of them that they be all the sons of their God."

²¹ Cf. Deut. 4 6-8.

²² Ass. Mos. 1 14.

The bondservant abideth not in the house forever; the son abideth forever.

Here no one thinks of writing with a capital, because the sense is obviously, "Any one who is a son." The fourth evangelist is reproducing Gal. 4 30, and we have only to turn to that passage to find Paul using both elements of the saying about Knowing God and Being Known (recognized, acknowledged as a son) of God, and then a little further on referring to the law as a "yoke of bondage." If in addition we find this use of the term "the son" to be justified by contemporary Jewish application of these complementary ideas of knowing God and being known of him, it will appear that such is certainly the intention of the logion itself, whatever later evangelists may have made of it.

If we accept the fuller Matthaean form, which is also the Lukan in all forms of the text except Codex Vercellensis,²³ the combination of the reciprocal sayings is paralleled by Paul in his own vindication of the sonship and heirship of the "sinners of the gentiles" without the "yoke of bondage." The disposition of his Galatian converts to take up the yoke of Mosaic ordinances is met with a passionate adjuration to remember the Spirit of adoption which they had received,

Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. So that thou art no longer a slave but a son; and if a son, an heir also through God. . . . But now, having come to know God, or rather to be known (acknowledged, recognized as sons) by God, how turn ye back into bondage. . . . Be not held again in a yoke of bondage.

Knowing and being known come into the same antithesis again in 1 Cor. 13 12,

Then shall I know (have the gift of gnosis) even as also I have been known (acknowledged).

We may leave the question unsettled whether it is Paul who has set the example of this antithesis to our canonical Matthew, or the logion which suggests it to Paul. The decision will depend upon the solution of the problem of the text. More important

²³ Cod. Vercell. gives in Lk. (not Mt.), *Omnia mihi tradita sunt a patre, et nemo nobis quis est pater nisi filius, et cuicumque voluerit filius revelavit.*

than the question whether the saying about Being Known (i.e. recognized, acknowledged as a son) by God, was or was not originally connected with the one on the Knowledge of God, is the question of the meaning the former saying was intended to convey. What was the current application of the phrase "to be known (*γνωθῆναι*) by God"?

On this point we have the testimony of a collection of logia still older, apparently, than that referred to by Papias. The Pastoral Epistles, attributed to Paul, and in some parts admittedly Pauline, make repeated reference to "faithful sayings," and especially to "the wholesome words (*λόγοι*), even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ," as the standard of doctrine (1 Tim. 6 3). Among the quoted sayings of these epistles are two which together are said to constitute the "seal" of God's foundation, the Church,

The Lord hath acknowledged (*ἔγνω*) those that are his own, and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from iniquity (2 Tim. 2 19, cf. Mt. 7 21-23).

The context shows that the writer has in mind the same complementary principles as are illustrated in the parable of the great supper with its Matthaean appendix of the guest unprovided with the wedding garment.²⁴ God's spiritual building has this twofold basis; on the one side no exclusion of those whom God himself accredits, "as many as are led by the Spirit of God are sons"; on the other no inclusion of the morally discredited, "by their fruits ye shall know them." Because

God said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, . . . therefore
Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord,
And touch no unclean thing,
And I will receive you,
And be to you a Father,
And ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty
(2 Cor. 6 16-18).

These complementary principles of the older Paulinism are now embodied in the "seal" of the "foundation of God," just quoted.

The foregoing examples from the Pauline writings, which show

²⁴ Cf. the two kindred parables, also peculiar to Matthew, of the tares and the net full of fishes, Mt. 13 24-30 36-43 47-50.

what was the primitive treatment of the complementary principles of "knowing" and "being known of" God, should be our guide to the historic sense of the *logion*, or *logia*, of Mt. 11 25-27, 13 16-17 = Lk. 10 21-24. To the scribes' contention that no man can claim to be a son who does not "know" the God whom he claims as his Father, and who has no revelation of his will (Rom. 2 18), reply is made by Jesus, in words which rest on Is. 29 14, that the little ones, whom he welcomes as his brother, sister, and mother because they hear the will of God and do it, have a better, fuller "knowledge" than "the wise and understanding." This is the good pleasure (*εὐδοκία*) of the "Lord of heaven and earth," and it behooves us to be glad and rejoice that the deepest knowledge of God is not intellectually but morally conditioned. Those "know his will" who perceive and imitate his spirit of unstinted, universal goodness "even to the unthankful and the evil." These, and not scribes, nor priests and Levites, official custodians and interpreters of the law, are qualified to "make revelation" to others as widely as they will. Jesus expresses this in the pregnant, epigrammatic phrase so characteristic of him,

It is the son who is competent to give revelation of the Father; but this knowledge is not that of the wise and understanding, it is such as is given to those who are simple-hearted as babes.

V. RELATION OF THE SAYING TO THAT ON THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM, MT. 16 19.

Since the complementary idea of being known of God is not certainly found in both gospels, we cannot be sure that it is not a reflection of that great experience of the Church for which Paul has given us the term "the witness of the Spirit of adoption." From the stammering lips of those who prayed as the Spirit gave them utterance Paul takes down the cry *Abba, Abba*,²⁵ appealing to it as a superhuman testimony that through faith we are made

²⁵ The parallel to the above-quoted passage (Gal. 4 6 7) in Rom. 8 14-16 26-27 shows that the reference is to the charisma of tongues. Those who "prayed in a tongue," amid their inarticulate groanings and utterances intelligible only to God (Rom. 8 26, 1 Cor. 14 14-17), stammered forth the infant's cry, *Abba, Abba*.

sons and heirs of God. This one thing only need be known, if any arise to dispute the right of gentiles to be reckoned heirs of the promise. Received they the Spirit? If God have recognized as a son, who dare dispute the title? In this sense of recognition the principle was admitted as decisive in all branches of the Church. Since Pentecost it had been a "seal of the foundation," for "the Lord accrediteth them that are his." But the earliest struggle against the Jewish spirit of exclusiveness was earlier than Pentecost. To Jesus also the very essence of his mission had been to break down the artificial barriers which excluded publicans and sinners from the inheritance of sons, to resist the usurped prerogative of the "power of the keys." The scribes claimed authority to "bind and loose." By virtue of their occupation of Moses' seat they held "the key of knowledge," and used it to hinder the entrance of the repentant masses into the kingdom. Though preserved in late and variant form, the utterance attributed to Jesus which bestows this usurped power of the keys on the brotherhood of his disciples, or on their leader and representative, is a genuine echo of his championship of the people's cause, and similar parallels to the saying, "The Lord hath accredited them that are his," are to be found in Mt. 18 18,

Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

and in Mt. 16 17-19,

On this rock I will build my Church. . . .

I will give unto thee (Peter) the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

These reported sayings of Jesus, before they were perverted into the decretals of a new ecclesiastical despotism, were themselves a declaration of the liberty and independence of the "little flock." Instead of suffering the little ones to be excluded from the synagogue by those who held the keys, claiming power to bind and loose, making the son or daughter of Abraham who resisted their tyranny "as the gentile and the publican," he that hath the key of David restores it to his own. The key of knowledge, the key

of authority, the key of admission or exclusion, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, are given to the Church itself or to the Church in the person of Peter as its leader. Alas that the Church only repeated under the name of Peter the old-time tyranny of the scribes! These several appeals to a saying of Jesus of this type show that he was understood to have protested against the scribes' usurpation of this power, and that the references in the Pauline writings to God as the sole accreditor of his own sons have an authentic basis. Even were the reference to the son's being known of the Father held to be borrowed from Paul, yet Jesus himself had in substance established it as a "seal of the foundation of God" that not man but the Lord accrediteth them that are his.

In fact the commission of Peter in Mt. 16 17-19, with its significant reference to "the gates of Hades" which had closed upon the crucified Leader, is closely related to the commission to "Peter and the twelve" which forms the central feature in all forms of the resurrection story. God gave him to be made manifest unto them in order that *forgiveness of sins* through repentance and faith in his name might be preached unto all the gentiles, beginning from Jerusalem (Lk. 24 47-49). The authority of their commission is the authority to "loose" from sins. Its token is baptism. Its seal is the outpoured Spirit. Cf. Mt. 28 18 19, Jn. 20 21-23.

VI. BEARING OF THE SAYING ON THE MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS.

But we are more concerned with that portion of the logion which is certainly attested by both Matthew and Luke, and which vindicated the claim of the "babes" to have that true knowledge of God without which one cannot be deemed a son. Here if anywhere we can discover the secret of the messianic consciousness of Jesus. The title "Son of man" which has been called his "favorite self-designation," and to which many turn as the principal source of first-hand knowledge on this vital point, is doubly open to question. On philological grounds it is doubtful if the phrase could have existence in the Aramaic spoken by

Jesus. If it did, that very existence was owing to connotations most foreign to the sane and well-poised quality of Jesus' character and teaching. His fundamental conception of his calling is not the apocalyptic, and appears not in the eschatological sayings but in the Sermon on the Mount. The apocalyptic notions of his mission and destiny may easily have been superimposed upon his own conception in the superheated atmosphere of the primitive Church, while the reverse is inconceivable. Jesus was not a visionary. The Danielic figure looms large to the vision of post-resurrection prophets and seers, but not on the mental and spiritual horizon of the Carpenter of Nazareth, least of all as offering a career for himself. The phrase which is really and demonstrably characteristic of him, the title which in the oldest documents of Christianity is universally pervasive, as against not one single occurrence of the term Son of man, is that of Son of God. In any case we may say that as certainly as the conception of Exodus and Hosea that Israel is God's son (to say nothing of the as yet unethicized common Semitic idea) is antecedent to the apocalyptic figure of Daniel, Enoch, and 2 Esdras, just so certainly is the conception of sonship to God in Jesus' mind antecedent to that of Son of man, whatever may have been the apocalyptic dreams to which he turned under the growing certainty of martyrdom. It is true that we give small notice to this humble title "son of God" except when the translators assist our vision with a capital letter, or when in some way its simple ethical sense is transcended; but that which really concerns Jesus and Paul is "the inheritance of sons," by which they both mean "sons of the Highest," "sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty."²⁶ It is also true that a Roman gospel, admittedly of the second generation, gives something more than an ethical meaning to this designation "the son of God," which in our logion Jesus applies to himself only as representative, leader, and champion of those whose sonship required to be vindicated. In Mark the title "the Son of God" has already a special and peculiar sense allied to the Pauline metaphysics. The outcome of this process of apocalyptic transcendentalizing appears in the vision-story of the Transfiguration, a typical apocalypse, wherein the rabbinic device of

²⁶ Mt. 5 45 = Lk. 6 35, 2 Cor. 6 18.

the *bath gol*, or voice from heaven, is employed to set forth along with the characteristic imagery of this type of literature the author's Pauline or quasi-Pauline Christology. For the author of this vision-story the real being of Jesus was revealed when the eyes of his intimates had been enlightened to pierce the veil of his flesh and to behold the Son of God, not in the ethical, but in the apocalyptic sense, even the Beloved, of pre-existent glory. The same device of the voice from heaven and the same phraseology are employed in the preliminary narrative which Mark prefixes to his gospel. His doctrine of Jesus the pre-existent Son of God is intelligible to us, and was acceptable to his own and later generations. The Gospel of Mark became the very framework of gospel tradition. But if we look at the references to divine sonship which pervade that other source, which nearly all critics admit to be an older and better authority, we shall find the term "son of God" to bear a far different sense. Jesus is still "the son," but only as "the first-born of many brethren." This sense is as little "theocratic" as it is metaphysical. It is historic, ethical, and religious. It finds its affiliations not with the crude metaphysics of the Roman gospel, nor with the profounder and subtler speculations of the Ephesian, but in the familiar subject of dispute in the Pauline epistles, the demand for the admission to the Abrahamic inheritance of those who have no title under the law, the question whether our inspired cry of *Abba, Father*, is or is not a sufficient earnest of our sonship. Most of all it finds its attestation in the common background of current Jewish interpretation of the messianic hope.

VII. THE MESSIANIC HOPE FROM THE PROPHETS TO THE PHARISEES.

It is an utter misapprehension of this national expectation in its origin to regard it as having had primarily to do with royalty. The passage which in modern times is commonly taken as its very foundation, the promise to David of a successor to his throne,²⁷ finds scarcely an echo in the entire New Testament. In reality the hope is far older, far broader, far more fundamental. Not

²⁷ 2 Sam. 7 13, Ps. 132 11, referred to in Acts 2 30.

David's successor primarily, but Israel itself is God's son. The fundamental passage is Ex. 4 22,

Thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, my first-born; and I have said unto thee, Let my son go, that he may serve me; and thou hast refused to let him go: behold I will slay thy son, thy first-born.

God first adopted the people,

When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt (Hos. 11 1).

If in later times he became a Father to their king, it was for the people's sake.

Professor F. C. Porter has very properly reminded us that the prophets represent themselves not as creators, but as critics of the messianic hope. The hope itself was as old as Israel. It partook in its earliest form of the crudity of the common Semitic conception of the divinity of a land as the progenitor of its population. Jahveh, however, unlike neighboring divinities, had not begotten Israel, but "adopted" him, when he was a bond-slave in Egypt. This made the relation ethical and spiritual.²⁸ "You only have I known (acknowledged)" is Jahveh's word through Amos, but this acknowledgment was the free choice of a "Lord of heaven and earth," who directs all the nations and rules them under a law of righteousness. Amos became the first great critic of this national hope by subjecting it to ethical conditions. He ethicized the doctrine of election.

In the time of Jesus the messianic hope, in spite of all its transformations and refinements, had by no means lost its fundamental significance. The experiences of the monarchy had caused it to crystallize around the theocratic figure of the son of David; the experiences of national disintegration and admixture with the world had clothed this figure with mythological attributes and widened the programme of his activity. Most of all, life under the law had profoundly modified the conception of its conditions. But even in Jesus' time the messianic hope remained fundamentally what it had always been. Israel is God's son and heir, Israel must possess God's land, that is the world. The destruction of

²⁸ Budde, *Israel before the Exile*, 1897.

Jerusalem by Titus only elicits from a groaning patriot and believer the cry,

O Lord, thou hast said that for our sakes thou madest this world. . . . And now, O Lord, behold these nations which are reputed as nothing be lords over us and devour us. But we thy people, whom thou hast called thy first-born, thy only-begotten and thy fervent lover (beloved?), are given into their hands. If the world now be made for our sakes, why do we not possess for an inheritance our world? How long shall this endure? (2 Esdr. 6 56-59).

Many were the forms under which the old belief in the adoption and the inheritance survived, from the cry of the Zealot for national hegemony to the philosopher's academic demonstration that the truly wise man is the "heir of the things belonging to God."²⁹ Of these many developments we are concerned with but one, the religious. Pharisaism had withdrawn from the nationalistic movement against the forcible hellenization of Antiochus Epiphanes, as soon as that movement degenerated into a mere struggle for self-aggrandizement on the part of the successors of Simon the Maccabee. The Pharisees became the Puritans of the first century B.C. by eliminating worldly ambition from the messianic programme. Israel's calling was to be the people of the law. Righteousness, "even that which is of the law," was to be its work and ambition in the world. Its reward was to be in a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. This was the deepest and most fruitful movement of the times in the bosom of a people whose genius had ever been religious. Its purest expression appears in the so-called Psalms of the Pharisees, nearest in sentiment of all uncanonical writings to the canticles of Luke.

In true Pharisaism, of the type which produced the noblest and greatest of the followers of Jesus, sonship in the religious sense became the very essence of the messianic hope and the true prerogative of Israel. To be the son of God by knowing and doing his will is the Pharisee's ideal for his people. The Christ, when he comes, "shall take knowledge of them that they be all the sons of their God." (Ps. Sol. 17 30). Many generations earlier we have the same ideal in the same phraseology

²⁹ Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum heres?*

from the son of Sirach. The Great Repentance of Mal. 4 6 here became a turning in mutual reconciliation not of mere earthly families, but "of the Father (God) to the son (Israel) and of the son to the Father," thus restoring the tribes of Israel (Ecclus. 48 10). A century later than Sirach the author of the Wisdom of Solomon delineates "the righteous man" in traits that acknowledge no ethnic limitation, but he has in reality Israel—a Pharisaic Israel—to sit for the portrait.

Let us lie in wait for the righteous man,
 Because he is of disservice to us,
 And is contrary to our works,
 And upbraideth us with sins against the law.
 He professeth to have knowledge of God,
 And nameth himself son (*παις*) of the Lord.
 And he abstaineth from our ways as from uncleannesses.
 The latter end of the righteous he calleth happy,
 And vaunteth that God is his Father.
 Let us see if his words be true,
 Let us try what shall befall in the ending of his life;
 For if the righteous man is God's son, he will uphold him (Wisdom of Solomon 2 12-18).

An earlier contemporary of the same Alexandrian school claims it as a testimony of the wise Egyptian priests that the Jews are

men of God, a name which belongs not to others, but only to him who worships the true God. For these others are men of food and drink and clothing; for all their thought is taken for these things. But those who are of our faith give no heed to these things, but their whole life long they are concerned with searching out the works of God (Aristeas 140, *ca.* 90 B.C.).

These Alexandrian Jewish writers of the first century B.C. seem indeed "not far from the kingdom of God," with their ideal of Israel's destiny and prerogative. But we must come down to the writing of a Palestinian Pharisee almost contemporary with Jesus himself for the nearest approximation to the Sermon on the Mount in an expression of the messianic hope. He hopes for nothing less than the outpouring of a spirit of righteousness, God's Spirit, who by communicating his nature makes Israel indeed his son, and thereby exalted, as in the Pauline writings, "over every angel and spirit."

And Moses fell upon his face and prayed, and said: O Lord, my God, forsake not thy people and thy heritage, that it should walk in the error of its own heart, and deliver them not over into the hands of the gentiles, that these may not rule over them and compel them to sin against thee. Let thy mercy be exalted over thy people, and create in them a right disposition and let not the spirit of Belchor (Belial) rule in them, to accuse them before thee and to seduce them from all paths of righteousness, that they should perish far away from thy countenance. For they are thy people and thine heir, whom thou didst save by thy great might out of the hand of the Egyptians. Create in them a clean heart and a holy spirit and let them not be entangled in their sin henceforth and forever.

And God said unto Moses, I know their contrariness and their (evil) disposition and their stiff neck, and they will not hearken until they acknowledge their sin and the sins of their fathers. After that they will return unto me in all uprightness, with all their heart and all their soul. And I will circumcise the foreskin of the hearts of their children, and will create in them a holy spirit and make them pure, so that they shall no more turn away from me from that day to all eternity. And their soul shall follow me and all my law, and they shall do according to my commandment, and I will be a father to them, and they shall be my children. And they shall be called the children of the living God. And all angels and all spirits shall know that they are my children and that I am their Father in truth and righteousness and that I love them (Jubilees 1 19-25).

It is a Puritanism of this noble type which is represented in its degeneracy by the synagogue-system of scribe and Pharisee in the time of Jesus. After the downfall of the Maccabees reaction against Zealot nationalistic fanaticism on the one side and Sadducean worldliness on the other had thrown back the religious-minded upon the orthodoxy of the written law. The Pharisee became a blind follower of the scribe, his blind guide. Insistence on the letter of a deified law, whose ideal was separation from the ceremonially unclean,³⁰ carried exclusiveness to a degree unmatched even by the Puritanism of Scotland or New England. For the "people of the land," the "publicans and sinners," the ordinary peasant or fisherman or handicraftsman of half-heathen Galilee, the Mosaic ideal of separation was utterly impracticable, its prescriptions "a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear" (Acts 15 10), the scribes' interpretations of its requirements were a "binding of heavy burdens and grievous to be borne which they themselves touched not with one of their

³⁰ Ex. 33 16, Jer. 51 45, Ez. 20 34, 41 Is. 52 11, 2 Cor. 6 17.

fingers." The poor man, the unlettered, the ordinary artisan and father of a family saw himself under this odious and hypocritical tyranny gradually excluded from all share in the world to come. He too was a son of Abraham, but by decree of the scribes he saw himself deprived of his Abrahamic inheritance in favor of the little coterie of the Pharisees (the "separated"), whose legalistic righteousness was only too often mercenary and external. There were but two classes, the *chaberim*, or consistent devotees of the law, a religious caste withdrawing from the defiling contact even of their kindred and coreligionists of less strict observance, and the *am ha-aretz*, the out-caste who had "no share in the world to come."

The religious centre of gravity cannot be permanently swung to this social extreme. The reaction, when it came, was correspondingly sweeping and profound. John the Baptist and Jesus revived the old prophetic spirit of religious democracy. They led a rebellion of the simple Israelite against the usurpation of the Abrahamic inheritance by the scribes and Pharisees. Like another Elijah John led a "great repentance,"³¹ the token of which was the new rite of baptism, self-evident in meaning, unknown to legal prescription. The publicans and sinners flocked to him; the scribes and Pharisees held aloof. His martyrdom could not check the movement. In the Carpenter of Nazareth it found a new and greater leader, who himself sought out the lost sheep of the house of Israel in Galilee, and defended the lost son against the grudging elder brother. His fisherman followers he taught to cast nets for the scattered wanderers from the kingdom.³² Like a trustee for an orphan defrauded of his inheritance, Jesus demanded restoration to the "little ones" of their rightful part in Israel's spiritual inheritance. He insisted upon the full content of this inheritance, and on that which is of primary importance, the spiritualities, before the temporalities. The conflict with the intrenched power of scribes and Pharisees was a war to the knife. Since the days of John the Baptist—the

³¹ This was the function of Elias redivivus in contemporary legend, cf. Mal. 4:6 resting on 1 Kings 18:37. See Bacon, "Elias and the Men of Violence," Expositor, sixth series, xxxi (July, 1902).

³² Mk. 1:17, resting on Jer. 16:16.

Elias who should come as a "restorer of the tribes" to "admit those who had been wrongfully excluded and to exclude those wrongfully admitted" to Israel's inheritance³³—the kingdom of heaven had suffered violence, and men of violence were now prepared to take it by force. Jesus was unsparing in his invective against this one class, and this only; and he has not neglected to tell us why. He told them to their faces that the law and the prophets, as the charter of their monopoly, could endure only "until John." He predicted (Mt. 23) that they would not spare him; and they did not.

It was his championship in this conflict which first gave to Jesus his right to be called the Son of God. It was for the sake of his little flock that he demanded it, and for them that he defended it with his life. Sonship to God was the vital element of that religious inheritance of which the synagogue-system, the legalism of scribe and Pharisee, sought to rob the simple Israelite by its usurpation of the key of knowledge and its pretence of doing the will of the Father. Therefore it is that Jesus thanks the infinite Lord of heaven and earth that the knowledge of him is no monopoly of the wise and understanding, that it is not the learned in the law that know him, but the little ones, the babes, if so be that they have the spirit of sons in kindness even to the unthankful and the evil. Such knowledge, such inward light, he claims to have in his own person, the tradition not of dead authorities, but of his Father, and he maintains that they who are qualified to give "revelation" are those who are sons in this sense. A good Samaritan is a better teacher than a selfish and cowardly priest or Levite.

More than this, he disputes also the scribal usurpation of the power to "bind and loose," to admit and to exclude. Who is the son? John the Baptist had said, "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," and the publicans and sinners had repented at his word. None denied the Pharisees' right to the name. But Jesus had promised salvation to the repentant publican, "forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham." Which has the better title to the inheritance of the sons of God? Jesus puts the question in the form of the parable of the two sons.

³³ So Edujoth viii, 7, resting on Ecclus. 48 10.

Whether of these twain did the will of the Father, he that said, I go, sir, and went not; or he that afterward repented and went? . . . Therefore the publicans and harlots go into the kingdom of heaven before you.

When Paul lays it down as the token of sonship that one be "led by the Spirit of God" (Rom. 8 14), he is adapting the ancient principle of the foundation of the Church, that "the Lord (by the 'seal' of the Spirit) acknowledgeth them that are his," to Jesus' more strictly ethical test, "Whosoever doeth the will of my Father, the same is my brother and sister and mother." In an earlier writing he enunciates his principle in a more primary form. In the Galatian parallel to Rom. 8 15³⁴ he defines the divine "acknowledgement" to be the sending forth into our hearts of the Spirit of his Son teaching us as sons the cry Abba, Father. Whosoever receiveth the Spirit is a son. According to Jesus, "whosoever doeth the will," were it publican, harlot, or Samaritan, is "known of God," and "doing the will" is exemplified, not in the Pharisees with their yoke of bondage, but in those whose inward disposition is akin to the Father's. Paul is not original, but only a follower of Jesus, as he claimed to be, in meeting the pretensions of intrenched and traditional authority by the self-evidencing testimony of the Spirit, which makes foolish the wisdom of the wise and gives its revelation to babes. By no other conceivable course was it possible to meet the authority of the scribes; for with them in pre-eminent degree knowledge was indeed power. Unless he were ready to abandon the cause of the disinherited "little ones," whose leader and champion he had become since John was shut up in prison, Jesus had no alternative but to maintain, "No man knoweth the Father save the son." In opposition to the "violence" which made the key of knowledge an instrument for excluding from the kingdom the repentant "publicans and harlots," while none but submissive bearers of the yoke of the law as interpreted by themselves were recognized as sons, Jesus had no alternative but to appeal to a binding and loosing that has validity in heaven. This is the principle implied, if not directly expressed, in the saying,

No man knoweth who the son is (who is a son) save the Father.

³⁴ Gal. 4 6.

VIII. LATER DEVELOPMENT.

Our oldest and most trustworthy source has but this single instance in which Jesus seems to claim messianic honors for himself. We have agreed that it may well be called "the Johanne passage," for it forms a manifest point of departure for the later theological and metaphysical interpretations of the title Son of God which reach their culmination in the Fourth Gospel. But the metaphysics is not from Jesus. In the passage from Q, historically interpreted, there is not one trace of this. There is not even the exclusive sense in which our second evangelist in two or three instances has employed the title. Jesus is simply championing the cause of the disinherited sons and daughters of Abraham, when he maintains that if any

Professeth to have knowledge of God,
And nameth himself son (*παις*) of the Lord, . . .
And vaunteth that God is his father,

he must be a "son of the Highest," because he has that kind of spirit which the Father manifests. He is continuing the work of him who had said, "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham," as John himself was consciously continuing the message of Amos, the prophet of ethical election. Jesus speaks simply as leader, defender, and representative of the "babes," when he thanks the "Lord of heaven and earth" for the revelation that is "delivered" to those that have eyes to see and ears to hear, though it be "hid from the wise and understanding." There is no pretension in this to superhuman, or even to messianic, dignity for his own person; and the utterance was not so understood by his hearers. Nevertheless it would logically lead to this if the conflict with the oligarchy of scribes and Pharisees were maintained. And so it was.

IX. RELATION TO THE CLAIM OF MESSIAHSHIP.

A pivotal point of the Petrine tradition embodied in our second gospel (Mk. 8 29) is the tendering to Jesus by Peter, with the support of the eleven disciples, of the title "the Christ." This

was during a temporary lull in the conflict. The great collision in Capernaum with "the scribes who came down from Jerusalem" had issued in Jesus' exile from the scene of his early popularity, and in the permanent interruption of his public teaching in Galilee. There remained, besides Samaria, which he felt no call to evangelize, only Judaea beyond Jordan, and Jerusalem. Toward these he set his face, with Jerusalem as his goal. The odds against him and his little flock would now be doubled. If he proposed to reclaim for them full rights in the temple as well as the synagogue, he would have to issue his challenge to an alliance of the priestly hierarchy with the already hostile scribal oligarchy. No wonder he predicted for himself a fate like John's. But consistency allowed no other alternative. He had either to desert the cause of the disinherited sons, or else to present their claims at the doors of the temple itself, protest against the abuses of the high-priestly clique, and demand a restoration of the temple to the uses of a house of prayer for all the people.

Under what other rôle could one become the champion of the lost sheep of the house of Israel against the faithless shepherds who had served themselves of the flock, than as the true Shepherd of Ezekiel's vision?

He shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I, the Lord, will be their God, and my servant David prince among them (Ez. 34 23-24).

If the Pharisees had not themselves led the way in cancelling all political significance from the messianic hope, Jesus could never have consented to be called the Christ. As it was, the title is to him the least acceptable of all possible descriptions of his mission. In spite of his utmost endeavor to prevent being forced into the false position of a leader of Zealot nationalistic agitation, it furnished to his enemies their best opportunity for misrepresentation, nay, the very snare by which they actually compassed his death. Palpably, manifestly, it was a crown of thorns that Peter was ignorantly offering him at Caesarea Philippi. And yet in some sense he must take it, or be recreant to the trust that the God of these lost sheep and lost sons had imposed upon him. Their inheritance was the full inheritance of sons. He was not at lib-

erty to compound with the usurpers for a part. They had no other leader or representative. The knowledge of sonship had been delivered to him. Now to these "babes" also had come something more than that revelation of the Father, and of their own sonship which he had awakened in them. They had received now a revelation on their own account. It came not from flesh and blood but from the Father himself when they now perceived that vindication of their sonship depended upon him as "the Son," the Christ.

The movement of Pharisaism had had this great merit, that it had changed the perspective of the messianic hope. Israel was first to become God's son by knowing and doing his revealed will. Afterwards it should receive its inheritance. The spirit of censorious exclusiveness, admitting to participation in the inheritance not those whose sonship was evinced by a spirit kindred to the Father's, but those only who submitted to the yoke of legal prescriptions, had shown the fatal unfitness of the Pharisees' method of attaining the messianic hope, but had left the ideal itself in broader, distincter outline and nobler proportions than ever before. The Pharisees' method was that of the Puritans of all ages.

Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, saith the Lord,
And touch no unclean thing.

Their ideal was:

And I will receive you,
And will be to you a Father,
And ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

For this ideal of the messianic hope there is but one title which can appropriately be applied to the personality which becomes its leader. Such a leader must designate himself "the Christ, the Son of the living God."

R. H. Charles has called our attention to a phenomenon which confirms Professor Porter's far-reaching observation that the prophets are not creators but critics of the messianic hope. It is that the manifold titles applied to the Messiah in the literature of this period, particularly the apocalyptic literature, wherein the

figure of the Messiah plays so large a part, such titles as "the Elect," "the Just," "the Saint," "the Beloved," "the Servant," "the Heir," are in almost every instance derived from the titles bestowed on Israel as the people of God. The Messiah is "the Elect" as representative and head of the elect people, "the Just" as head and representative of "the just," "the Saint" as representing "the people of the saints of the Most High," "the Beloved"—and we may rightfully add in view of the passage cited above from Second Esdras, "the Only-begotten"—as representing the people whom God had "called his beloved, his only-begotten," "the Heir" as representing their claim to the inheritance of God's creation. It is so also with the title "the Son." For one whose ideal of the messianic hope is that of the passages quoted from Ecclesiasticus, Aristeeus, Wisdom, the Psalter of Solomon, and Jubilees, who shares the prophetic ideal as enlarged and refined by the experiences of the exile, the return, the Maccabean revolt, and the Pharisean reaction against the later Hasmonaeans, there is no title so expressive of the work to be achieved by this Friend of publicans and sinners as "the Son." Not because in some peculiar and metaphysical sense he taketh hold upon the nature of God, but because "he taketh hold on the seed of Abraham" to bring them to their inheritance, because he is "made in all points like unto his brethren," because he is "the first-born of many brethren." It is in this sense that Jesus the Son of God was willing also to become the Christ for his brethren and companions' sakes. When we go back to his own words, his claim appears in its true historical light as a sacrifice of his life to win back for the disinherited "little ones" of Israel their "right to be called the sons of God." Paul's invincible logic applied the principle to the disinherited sons of all humanity, and made Jesus known as "the Saviour of the world." When, a generation later, the Roman disciple of a disciple undertakes to relate "the gospel of Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God," he manifests the disposition we should expect. What he is eager to prove is that Jesus was endowed with this distinction in his own right by a voice from heaven, that he contended for it and was vindicated in it by a life of wonder-working power and goodness, and by a supernatural resurrection from the dead. Fortunately even Paul,

eager as he is to exalt the divinity of his Redeemer, and ready with a doctrine of his descent from pre-existent messianic glory, does not pervert the doctrine of "sonship" into something which appertains to Christ in distinction from us, but loyally presents it as that which he possesses on our behalf, and as our representative;

When the fulness of the time came God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father. So that thou art no longer a bond-servant but a son; and if a son, then an heir, through God. Howbeit, at that time, not knowing God, ye were in bondage. . . . But now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known of God, how turn ye back again? . . . For freedom did Christ set you free. Be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage (Gal. 4 4-9, 5 1).